

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for examining the application. Claims 1-22 are now pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0123238 to Hefetz et al. in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0050931 to Harman et al.

Applicant's independent claim 1 requires, among other things, including into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template links to content cached in the content engine and information about content availability to generate a portal page. The Examiner cited to ¶¶ 0105 and 0049 of Harman et al. as teaching or suggesting this limitation.

However, neither the cited text nor any other text of Harman et al. teaches or suggests including into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template links to content cached in the content engine and information about content availability to generate a portal page, as required by Applicant's independent claim 1. Specifically, Harman et al. fails to teach or suggest including information about content availability into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template. ¶¶ 0105 of Harman et al. merely describes a particular type of tag used in a template created when formatting documents for presentation on a display device that is typically small in nature (i.e., a cellular phone, PDA, mobile computer, etc.), see ¶ 0105. The <More> tag as taught by Harman et al. allows a user to, if a document as formatted according to Harman et al. is split into multiple parts, move between those parts, see *at least* ¶¶ 0147 and 0157. The <More> tag, however, does not include any information about content availability. Nor does any other tag or anything else as taught by Harman et al. teach or suggest including any information about content availability. Indeed, the only time variations on the word "available" appear in Harman et al. are in reference to replacing images with text descriptions of the images (see ¶ 0071), that scripting is not available on many devices (see ¶ 0122), and splitting a single page into multiple pages (see ¶ 0151).

Page 9 of 12

For this reason alone, Harman et al. does not teach or suggest Applicant's independent claim 1, and thus Applicant's independent claim 1 is allowable over Harman et al., either alone or in combination with Hefetz et al.

Applicants' independent claims 12, 15, 21, and 22 all include limitations similar to those of Applicants' allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable independent claim 1, Applicants' independent claims 12, 15, 21, and 22 are themselves not obvious in light of Hefetz et al. in view of Harman et al., and thus, Applicants' independent claims 12, 15, 21, and 22 are allowable over the combination of Hefetz et al. with Harman et al.

Applicants' dependent claims 2-11, 13-14, and 16-20 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable independent claims 1, 12, and 15. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable independent claims 1, 12, and 15, Applicants' dependent claims 2-11, 13-14, and 16-20 are themselves not obvious in light of Hefetz et al. in view of Harman et al., and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 2-11, 13-14, and 16-20 are allowable over the combination of Hefetz et al. with Harman et al.

Further, Applicants' dependent claim 2 is allowable on its face over Hefetz et al. and Harman et al., either alone or in combination.

Applicants' dependent claim 2 requires, among other things, wherein including information about content availability further comprises the steps of: comparing a replication status to a catalog of files carried in the content engine to determine what files are locally cached and what files remain to be downloaded; and writing a list of files that remain to be downloaded to the portal page with an indicator of unavailability. The Examiner cites to lines 7-14 of ¶ 0056 and lines 4-15 of ¶ 0045 of Hefetz et al. as teaching or suggesting these limitations.

Applicants respectfully submit that the limitations of Applicant's dependent claim 2 are limitations on a limitation of Applicant's allowable independent claim 1 that, by

Applicants' own argument in the previous response, and by the Examiner's own admission in the current Office Action (see Office Action page 3), Hefetz et al. does not teach or suggest. Yet, the Examiner has cited to Hefetz et al. as teaching or suggesting these further limitations. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection, and do not believe it is possible for a reference that does not teach or suggest the broader limitation to teach or suggest a subset of that broader limitation. Nonetheless, Applicants respond to the substance of the rejection below.

Lines 7-14 of ¶ 0056 of Hefetz et al. state as follows:

The JSP template 660 defines the general structure/design of the page layout, and page layout definitions for the JSP template 660 can be stored in a PCD (Portal Content Directory--metadata repository implementation of the portal) 630. A portal component profile for the layout component 670 can represent the page layout definitions as stored in the PCD 630, and/or the JSP template 660 can be stored in the PCD 630.

At no point in this portion, nor in any other portion, of Hefetz et al. does Hefetz et al. teach or suggest wherein including information about content availability further comprises the steps of: comparing a replication status to a catalog of files carried in the content engine to determine what files are locally cached and what files remain to be downloaded. Indeed, there is no mention whatsoever in the cited text, or elsewhere, of a catalog of files carried in the content engine; that the catalog of files is compared to anything, much less a replication status; or that any determinations are made based on such comparisons.

Lines 4-15 of ¶ 0045 of Hefetz et al. state as follows:

For example, a portal developer may create a template with two iViews: a first iView on the left in a narrow column with a list of items to select, and a second iView on the right in a wide column with details of a current item selected in the list. The portal developer can readily select which components to place on a page, set permissions and/or attributes for user-specific personalization, specify the layouts of multiple portal pages by defining the portal templates in the GUI that presents visual representations of the portal pages to be generated at run-time using the templates, and set the structure of the content components in the templates.

At no point in this portion, nor in any other portion, of Hefetz et al. does Hefetz et al. teach or suggest wherein including information about content availability further

comprises the steps of: writing a list of files that remain to be downloaded to the portal page with an indicator of unavailability, as required by Applicant. Indeed, there is no mention whatsoever of a list of files that remain to be downloaded, that such a list is written, or that such a list includes an indicator of unavailability.

Thus, for at least any of the reasons given above, Hefetz et al. does not teach or suggest Applicant's dependent claim 2, and therefore, Applicant's dependent claim 2 is allowable over Hefetz et al., either alone or in combination with Harman et al.

Further, Applicant's dependent claims 3-6, 10, 13-14, and 16-20 are also themselves allowable on their faces over Hefetz et al. and Harman et al., either alone or in combination. Similar to Applicant's allowable dependent claim 2, Applicant's dependent claims 3-6, 10, 13-14, and 16-20 are all further limitations on a limitation found in each of Applicant's allowable independent claims 1, 12, and 15 that, by Applicant's own successful argument in the previous response and by the Examiner's own admission (*see at least* Office Action page 3), are not taught or suggested by Hefetz et al. Namely, all of these dependent claims include further limitations on the broader limitation of including into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template links to content cached in the content engine – which the Examiner states is not taught or suggested by Hefetz et al. As with Applicant's allowable dependent claim 2, Applicants find it impossible for Hefetz et al. to teach a subset (i.e., narrower version) of a limitation when Hefetz et al. does not teach the broader limitation. Applicants find this to be particularly true for Applicants' dependent claims 3, 10, 13-14, 16, and 18-20, which all include, among other limitations, a limitation regarding including links to content.

For at least this reason alone, Applicants' dependent claims 3-6, 10, 13-14, and 16-20 are not taught or suggested by Hefetz et al., and thus Applicants' dependent claims 3-6, 10, 13-14, and 16-20 are allowable over Hefetz et al., either alone or in combination with Harman et al.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of the application.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/SPM/
Shaun P. Montana, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 54,320
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS03-50(7980)

Dated: February 22, 2008